

FORM FOR TABLING A PARLIAMENTARY QUESTION

ORAL QUESTIONS	WRITTEN QUESTIONS
To be put to: COUNCIL <input type="checkbox"/> COMMISSION <input type="checkbox"/>	To be put to: PRESIDENT OF THE EUROPEAN COUNCIL <input type="checkbox"/> COUNCIL <input type="checkbox"/> COMMISSION <input type="checkbox"/> VICE-PRESIDENT / HIGH REPRESENTATIVE <input type="checkbox"/>
Question for oral answer with debate (Rule 115) <input type="checkbox"/>	Question for written answer (Rule 117) <input type="checkbox"/>
Question Time (Rule 116) <input type="checkbox"/>	Priority question (Rule 117(4)) <input type="checkbox"/>

AUTHOR(S): M. NATTRASS

SUBJECT: Thalidomide
(please specify)

TEXT:

Thalidomide was developed in the 1950s by the West German pharmaceutical company Chemie Grünenthal GmbH. It is a powerful drug that was sold over the counter and prescribed to many pregnant women principally during the period 1958 to 1962 before being withdrawn. There were over 20,000 live births of severely impaired babies world-wide though it is estimated that at least 100,000 babies died in utero. Then, knowing all this, they released the drug in Spain in 1965!

1. Can the Commission explain how EU citizens, originating from different Member States but all equally victims of the Thalidomide disaster, are not being compensated by Grünenthal?
2. Is it legally acceptable for Grünenthal to enjoy protection from a Member State in order not to be held responsible for the suffering of citizens residing in other Member States, when equality is one of the key values on which the EU is founded?
3. The Commission states that '*Health policy, as well as the organisation and delivery of healthcare, is a Member State competence under Article 168 of the Treaty. As such, injury compensation schemes are not a matter of EU competence*'. Can the Commission explain why Grünenthal is not held responsible for the damage and suffering it has caused due to its negligence? This is not about Health, this is about negligence.
4. Why should National governments of Member States be forced to provide compensation schemes out of money from their tax payers, when the cause is another member state blocking claims?
5. If the German Government is able to unilaterally protect a Company from claims, can we presume that the UK Government can protect UK Companies from claims originating from the other 27 members States?

Signature(s):

Date: 27/01/2014